



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,244	06/27/2003	Ping T. Tang	42P16420	8588
8791	7590	06/16/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			LE, JOHN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2863	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/608,244	Applicant(s) TANG, PING T.	
	Examiner John H. Le	Art Unit 2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10, 18-22 and 28-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11-17 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 03/17/2005.

Claims 1, 6, 16, 18, 26, 28, and 29 have been amended.

Drawings

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because drawings of Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 5, 6, 7 because lines, numbers, and letters not uniformly thick and well defined, clean, durable, and black (poor line quality). Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 4-5, 12-13, 16-17, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoffberg et al. (USP 6,418,424).

Regarding claims 1, 16, and 26, Hoffberg et al. disclose a data processing system, comprising: a processor; a memory coupled to the processor (Col.41, lines 50-58); and a process executed by the processor from the memory to cause the processor to identify an operation involving a plurality of input values (e.g. (Col.41, lines 50-58), invoke an object associated with the identified operation, (e.g. invoke information input by keyboard in computer to display, Col.42, lines 6-9, Col.43, lines 36-41) the object being predefined based on a type of the identified operation (e.g. Col.207, lines 37-40), perform the operation via the invoked object (e.g. Col.43, lines 35-36) by invoking a first function member of the object (at least one object having a plurality of functions, Col 162, lines 33-39), and automatically generate, as a part of the operation via the object invoking a second function member of the object (at least one object having a plurality of functions, Col 162, lines 33-39), accuracy information associated with the operation for each of the plurality of input values (e.g. Col.43, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 4, Hoffberg et al. disclose the object comprises one or more member functions to perform the operation (multi-function keys, Col.7, lines 52-57) and to substantial concurrently (Col.41, lines 4-8) generate the accuracy information associated with the operation (Col.43, lines 41-47).

Regarding claims 5, 17, and 27, Hoffberg et al. disclose the process further causes the processor to define a computational model (accuracy detector), as a member of the object, to generate the accuracy information for the operation (e.g. Col.88, lines 39-52).

Art Unit: 2863

Regarding claim 12, Hoffberg et al. disclose the accuracy information includes differences between a theoretical result and an actual result of the operation (e.g. Col.52, lines 19-42, Col.105, line 60-Col.106, line 17).

Regarding claim 13, Hoffberg et al. disclose the plurality of input values comprises multidimensional vectors of values (e.g. Col.39, lines 51-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3, 14, 15, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffberg et al. (USP 6,418,424) in view of Orton et al. (USP 5,717,877).

Regarding claim 2, Hoffberg et al. fail to disclose creating the object associated with the identified operation and initializing the object using the plurality of input values prior to performing the operation.

Orton et al. disclose creating the object associated with the identified operation and initializing the object using the plurality of input values prior to performing the operation (Col.31, lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 3, Orton et al. disclose receiving the plurality of input values as parts of parameters associated with the object when the object is created (Col.31, lines 26-36).

Art Unit: 2863

Regarding claims 14 and 24, Orton et al. disclose the object is invoked via an inheritance of an object oriented programming (OOP) environment (Col.33, lines 50-62).

Regarding claims 15 and 25, Orton et al. disclose overloading an operator associated with the operation via the OOP environment, such that the accuracy information is obtained transparently with respect to the actual operation (e.g. Col.25, lines 46-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inform creating the object associated with the identified operation and initializing the object using the plurality of input values prior to performing the operation as taught by Orton et al. in a data processing system of Hoffberg et al. for the purpose of providing an innovative object oriented application interface (Orton et al., Col.1, lines 35-37).

7. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffberg et al. (USP 6,418,424) in view of Anwar (US 5,767,854).

Regarding claims 11 and 23, Hoffberg et al. fail to disclose the operation comprises one of an addition, a multiplication, and a shifting operation.

Anwar discloses the operation comprises one of an addition, a multiplication, and a shifting operation (e.g. Col.4, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the operation comprises one of an addition, a multiplication, and a shifting operation as taught by Anwar in a data processing

Art Unit: 2863

system of Hoffberg et al. for the purpose of providing a user interface and data management system that allow a user to more efficiently visualize, display, manipulate, and analyze multi-dimensional data.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 6-10, 18-22, and 28-30 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 6, 18, and 28, none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests the combination steps of: identifying an operation a plurality of input value; invoking an object associated with the identified operation, the object including a computational model as a member of object to generate accuracy information for the operation, the computational model being defined by identifying a theoretical result of the operation based on an input value; defining an input independent error associated with the input value; defining an input dependent error associated with the input value; and obtaining an actual result of the operation based on the theoretical result, the input independent error, and input dependent error; performing the operation via the invoked object; and automatically generating, as a part of the operation via the object, the accuracy information associated with the operation for each of the plurality of input values. It is these limitations as they are claimed in the combination with other limitations of claim, which have not been found, taught or suggested in the prior art of record, that make these claims allowable over the prior art.

Regarding claim 29, none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests the combination of a data processing system comprising: a process executed by a processor from a memory to cause the processor to identify an operation a plurality of input value; invoke an object associated with the identified operation, the object including a computational model as a member of object to generate accuracy information for the operation, perform the operation via the invoked object; and automatically generate, as a part of the operation via the object, the accuracy information associated with the operation for each of the plurality of input values, wherein the computational model comprise one of a probability density function and one or more upper-bound functions representing the accuracy of the operation. It is these limitations as they are claimed in the combination with other limitations of claim, which have not been found, taught or suggested in the prior art of record, that make these claims allowable over the prior art.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-Applicant argues that the prior did not teach, "invoking an object having a first and second function members to perform the identified operation and to automatically generate accuracy information regarding the performed operation".

Examiner position is that Hoffberg et al. teach invoking an object (e.g. invoke information input by keyboard in computer to display, Col.42, lines 6-9, Col.43, lines 36-41) having a first and second function members to perform the

Art Unit: 2863

identified operation (at least one object having a plurality of functions, Col 162, lines 33-39) and to automatically generate accuracy information regarding the performed operation (e.g. Col.43, lines 41-47).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John H Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2275. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2863


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John H. Le

Patent Examiner-Group 2863

June 9, 2005


MICHAEL NGHIEM
PRIMARY EXAMINER